**2021-2022 Community Small Grants Program**

**Grant Review Committee**

**Minutes**

The 2021-22 committee members are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Kristi Wuttig | Lives in AHNA |
| Richard Barker | Lives in Linnton |
| Rosella Chapman | Studies in Downtown, lives in SW |
| Yvonne Montoya Morgan | Lives in Pearl |
|  |  |
| *Unavailable Round 1* |  |
| Evan Madden | Lives Downtown, works in NW Industrial |
| Kenneth Lebeja | Lives in Hillside |

**July 27 – Introductory Meeting and Overview**

**Committee Members Present:** Richard Barker, Yvonne Montoya Morgan, Kristi Wuttig, Rosella Chapman

**NWNW staff:** Anastasia Zurcher (prepared meeting notes)

The Grant program was reviewed briefly, and goals were discussed. Staff walked through a sample application evaluation to discuss points of interest and importance. Committee members did an initial review of each proposal in order to ask questions and get clarifications. A few budgets pieces had been misplaced and added into the folder. SWHRL will need a bit of clarification to their application. Linnton NA needs to resubmit the appropriate format. All others are complete and ready for review. The evaluation scoring sheet was also covered, and some adjustments made for clarity. Committee members will return their scores by Tuesday, August 3 in order to be compiled for the Thursday review session.

**AUGUST 5 – Application Review Meeting**

**Committee Members:** Yvonne Montoya Morgan, Kristi Wuttig, Rosella Chapman

Richard Barker was unavailable due to illness, no scores included

**NWNW staff:** Anastasia Zurcher

**Total funding available FY 2021-2022: $30,000**

**Total funding recommended Round 1: $15,401**

Full funding is recommended for each application. Although a few of the applications were not as well prepared as anticipated, each PROJECT submitted came across as being highly valuable to the communities in the NW and SW neighborhoods of Portland in which they will take place. Below, there are just a few individual notes on the proposals, as overall they were very high quality applications and remarks would be overly repetitive; great outreach strategy, proposed service is greatly needed, reasonable request that will be a good use of funds.

**SUMMARY of APPLICATIONS**

**Evaluation was made based on the following criteria and scale, for a total possible score of 40.**

***KEY: 0=incomplete 1=insufficient 2=weak 3=sufficient 4=strong 5=very strong***

1. Is the project well thought out and was enough attention given to details that would enable this project to be completed as outlined?
2. Which **program goals** have been identified for this project?
   1. Increase the number and diversity of people engaged in our communities
   2. Support local organizations’ efforts to expand leadership capacity and partnerships, and reach internal equity goals
   3. Amplify overlooked voices and increase public influence on decision making
   4. Support community preparedness and resiliency building efforts
   5. Expand local capacity to care for the physical environment

To what degree will theproposal **further those goals for the community** if the project is successful?

1. Does the project have a significant **reach or promotional plan**, relative to its intended audience? (*A 5 in this area must include a concerted effort to reach new populations.)*
2. To what degree does this project have an impact on the **NWNW coalition area**?
3. To what degree does this project include **under-represented** populations?   
   *(We define historically under-represented and under-served communities as those primarily composed of people of color, immigrants and refugees, low-income individuals and families, youth, people with disabilities, and lesbian, gay, bi, or transgender people.)*
4. To what degree does this project involve **partnerships** between organizations?   
   *(“A partnership means organizations must work together to implement the project and to ensure the project’s success, with a proof of partnership letter...” A score of 5 requires the applicant to meet this requirement (though the applicant could receive a lower score depending on the strength of the described support). Leveraged funds and donated materials build relationships similar to partnerships and could enable a score of up to 3 depending on the strength of these relationships in the grant proposal.)*
5. Is the **budget** realistic and sufficient to complete the proposed project?
6. To what degree does this organization have the **capacity** to complete the project?

**Downtown Neighborhood Association: DNA Help Team**

Downtown – Communications Project

Recommended Funding: $1,461

Summary: Fund outreach and materials for the Help Team volunteers who pick up trash, clean graffiti, report safety and livability issues and do outreach to Downtown stakeholders, businesses, residents and visitors on an ongoing (weekly) basis and via special cleanup events as needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. well thought out / attention to detail | 4.50 |
| 2. further those goals for the community | 3.88 |
| 3. significant reach or promotional plan | 3.25 |
| 4. impact on the NWNW coalition area? | 4.13 |
| 5. include under-represented populations? | 3.25 |
| 6. involve partnerships | 3.00 |
| 7. realistic budget | 3.75 |
| 8. capacity to complete | 4.50 |
| **Average Score Total** | **30.25** |

**First Congregational United Church of Christ: Art & Soul Fest**

Downtown – Community Building Project

Recommended Funding: $2,500

Summary: A neighborhood arts festival gathering housed & unhoused people living nearby; people working nearby; & members of the First Congregational UCC community who come downtown to worship. The event highlights art, poetry & music by homeless artists. Visitors will add their voices to collaborative art.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. well thought out / attention to detail | 5.00 |
| 2. further those goals for the community | 4.25 |
| 3. significant reach or promotional plan | 4.25 |
| 4. impact on the NWNW coalition area? | 4.25 |
| 5. include under-represented populations? | 5.00 |
| 6. involve partnerships | 5.00 |
| 7. realistic budget | 4.75 |
| 8. capacity to complete | 4.75 |
| **Average Score Total** | **37.25** |

**Friendly House: A/V Technology Support (Evergreen Winter Party)**

Northwest District – Community Building Event

Recommended Funding: $3,000

Summary: Friendly House wants to expand the overall accessibility of our program offerings to include more online hybrid versions of in-person events. To do so we need equipment to provide a better audio-visual experience, especially for bringing live events to an online audience in an engaging way.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. well thought out / attention to detail | 4.38 |
| 2. **further those goals for the community** | 4.00 |
| 3. significant **reach or promotional plan** | 4.25 |
| 4. impact on the NWNW coalition area? | 4.25 |
| 5. include under-represented populations? | 4.75 |
| 6. involve partnerships | 2.00 |
| 7. realistic budget | 4.00 |
| 8. **capacity** to complete | 4.75 |
| **Average Score Total** | **32.38** |

**Lift Urban Portland: Multi-Language Translations/Interpretations**

Northwest District – Communication Project

Recommended Funding: $2,500

Summary: Translation of flyers/brochures explaining Lift UP's on-site services in low-income apartment buildings into multiple languages. Language interpretation to further explain those services and assess potential client needs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. well thought out / attention to detail | 5.00 |
| 2. further those goals for the community | 4.75 |
| 3. significant reach or promotional plan | 4.25 |
| 4. impact on the NWNW coalition area? | 4.25 |
| 5. include under-represented populations? | 4.50 |
| 6. involve partnerships | 3.00 |
| 7. realistic budget | 4.25 |
| 8. capacity to complete | 4.75 |
| **Average Score Total** | **34.75** |

**Linnton Neighborhood Association: Linnton Newsletter**

Linnton – Communications Project

Recommended Funding: $2,000

Summary: Linnton is a small community of approximately 400+ homes in NW Portland. It is spread across 7 hills and is considered semi-rural with a high demographic of seniors. The newsletter is created and distributed by volunteers in our neighborhood.

Note: This application was incomplete. LNA has successfully completed this project for the last 11 years and is consistent in completing other grant requirements. The committee wanted to ensure this outreach tool was not eliminated from the community due to lack of funding.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. well thought out / attention to detail | 4.50 |
| 2. further those goals for the community | 0.00 |
| 3. significant reach or promotional plan | 4.50 |
| 4. impact on the NWNW coalition area? | 4.75 |
| 5. include under-represented populations? | 4.50 |
| 6. involve partnerships | 3.75 |
| 7. realistic budget | 1.50 |
| 8. capacity to complete | 3.50 |
| **Average Score Total** | **27.00** |

**SW Hills Residential League: SW Hills Outreach**

SWHRL – Communications Project

Recommended Funding: $1,440

Summary: SWHRL needs a new website to represent our commitment to diversity and civic engagement. This is a goal that we can do this summer to help build a strong platform and communications network for our neighborhood.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. well thought out / attention to detail | 4.00 |
| 2. further those goals for the community | 3.75 |
| 3. significant reach or promotional plan | 3.75 |
| 4. impact on the NWNW coalition area? | 4.00 |
| 5. include under-represented populations? | 3.25 |
| 6. involve partnerships | 1.00 |
| 7. realistic budget | 3.50 |
| 8. capacity to complete | 4.00 |
| **Average Score Total** | **27.25** |

**Sylvan-Highlands Neighborhood Association: Community Engagement & Beautification**

Sylvan-Highlands – Communications Project

Recommended Funding: $2,500

Summary: The primary objective is to increase and sustain involvement in the neighborhood association through a variety of outreach and community-building events. We propose a multi-pronged strategy of communication as well as neighborhood events to invite and involve the un-engaged members of our community.

Note: This project was very extensive and ambitious. The goal of getting more members in the community involved is great, but proposal lacked some detail. SHNA has some newly active volunteers and the committee agreed to support their enthusiastic plans, however will need to see additional details prior to award. At minimum a detailed timeline, which was missing from the application.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. well thought out / attention to detail | 4.50 |
| 2. further those goals for the community | 4.38 |
| 3. significant reach or promotional plan | 4.50 |
| 4. impact on the NWNW coalition area? | 4.25 |
| 5. include under-represented populations? | 3.50 |
| 6. involve partnerships | 2.25 |
| 7. realistic budget | 4.00 |
| 8. capacity to complete | 4.25 |
| **Average Score Total** | **31.63** |